

**Worksheet
Interim
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy
(DNA)**

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Note: This Worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled, "Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy" transmitting this Worksheet and the "Guidelines for using the DNA Worksheet," located at the end of the Worksheet.

A. Describe the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to issue a grazing permit to Eldon Kent for a portion of the Dry Prairie allotment (0885) in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.1, 4110.2-1(d) and (e), 4130.2, and 4130.3. This permit was previously held by Dick Hodder with an expiration date of 2/28/2007. However, in 1999 the recognized base property was sold to Roger Hamilton, who is now leasing the permit to Mr. Kent. Mr. Kent also leases Hamilton's other permit and this new permit will be attached to the same 35 acre base property as the other permit. The term of this permit is 3/1/2000 through 2/28/2010 or until the private base property lease expires, whichever comes first (43 CFR 4130.2(d)(3)). The Dry Prairie allotment is located within the northwest portion of the Gerber Block (see attached map.) When expired, the permit automatically would transfer back to Mr. Hamilton.

The parameters of the renewed permit will be 5/1 - 8/31 for 55 cattle - 220 active AUMs. There are also 140 AUMs of suspended grazing use, as a result of range re-adjudications in the 1960's. The previous grazing permit had the same parameters. The 1995 Klamath Falls R.A. ROD/RMP/RPS (Appendix H - page H-56) has the same parameters, with the exception of a slightly different season of use (see below).

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name*: *Klamath Falls R.A. Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (KFRA RMP/EIS dated September 1994)*
Date Approved: *June 1995 via the Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary (KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS)*

* List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans and activity, project, management, or program plans, or applicable amendments thereto)

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS lists the grazing parameters for the Dry Prairie allotment on page H-56 of Appendix H. The grazing use listed in that plan is the same as to be permitted with one exception - the plan suggested a slightly different season of use - 4/15 - 8/31, instead of 5/1 - 8/31. The proposed actions (transferred permit) season of use, is however, within the dates listed in the ROD/RMP and considered consistent.

In addition, the ROD/RMP/RPS states on page 62 to "Provide for livestock grazing in an environmentally sensitive manner, consistent with other objectives and land use allocations. Resolve resource conflicts and concerns and **ensure that livestock grazing use is consistent with the objectives and direction found in Appendix H (Grazing Management)**". (emphasis added) Also, later on that same page is the following: "Provide for initial levels of livestock grazing within the parameters outlined, by allotment, in Appendix H." This permit renewal meets that direction and is meeting ROD/RMP objectives - see answers to questions #3 and #5 later in this document.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for (in the below referenced sections), because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

N/A - the action is specifically provided for in the LUP.

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action:

Klamath Falls R.A. Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (KFRA RMP/EIS) dated September 1994 and approved via the June 1995 *Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary* (KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS). This is the overall plan for the Klamath Falls Resource Area.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

None additional.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of

that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action is consistent the grazing management identified in the KFRA RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative (called the "Proposed Resource Management Plan" or PRMP; specifics by allotment found in Appendix L- with the Dry Prairie allotment on L-56) and affirmed and implemented by the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS (allotment specific information found in Appendix H - page H-56). Environmental impacts of grazing, for all alternatives, is found in Chapter 4 - "Environmental Consequences" (4-1 through 4-143) - of the KFRA RMP/EIS.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action lies within the range of various alternatives identified and analyzed in the KFRA RMP/EIS (summarized in table S-1 "Comparisons of Allocations and Management by Alternative", pages 18-50; and S-2 "Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative", pages 52-53). This array and range of alternatives included the No Action alternative (status quo), five other alternatives (A through E) that covered a span of management from a strong emphasis on commodities production to a strong emphasis on resource protection/preservation, and the PRMP that emphasizes a balanced approach of producing an array of socially valuable products within the concept of ecosystem management. Since this plan is relatively recent, it is thought to adequately reflect "current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values".

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

A review was conducted to determine if any new information, studies, and analyses would materially differ from the data in the earlier analysis for these allotments during the RMP/EIS process. Included in these categories, and completed or extended since the date of the ROD/RMP/RPS, are the following:

a. During the 1997 and 1998 field seasons, an Ecological Site Inventory (ESI) was conducted for all the public lands in the Gerber Block, including this allotment. This inventory includes a Order 3 soil survey and the collection of current vegetative profile information that ultimately compares the existing vegetation against the Potential Natural Community (PNC). This survey rated virtually all the Dry Prairie allotment

(approx. 98% of the public acreage) as either “late seral” (good) or “potential natural community” (excellent) - both fully acceptable or better condition ratings.

b. As a section 7 (ESA) consultation allotment, this allotment receives some of the most intense rangeland monitoring efforts in the KFRA. A plethora of monitoring studies - condition, trend, utilization, climate, use supervision, etc. - have been collected within the allotment since finalization of the ROD/RMP in 1995. All of the studies taken as a whole show that conditions are good on the allotment and continue to improve with the current grazing system. This conclusion has been analyzed by numerous Biological Assessments/Evaluations prepared since 1993, with the results affirmed by the subsequent Biological Opinions.

c. As per 43 CFR 4180, the Klamath Falls Resource Area is in the process of implementing the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (S&G's), as developed by the Klamath PAC/RAC. A “Rangeland Health Standards Assessment” was completed for the Dry Prairie allotment in FY 1999. These assessments, based on various monitoring studies and other existing information, ascertain whether grazing management is meeting, not meeting, or making significant progress towards meeting, all 5 of the Standards for Rangeland Health. The Dry Prairie assessment, came to the following conclusion:

“Existing grazing management practices and/or levels of grazing use on the Dry Prairie allotment promote achievement or significant progress towards the Oregon Standards for Rangeland Healthy and conform with the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management.”

A statement requiring grazing management to continue to meet the S&G's in the future has been added to the “Terms and Conditions” section of the renewed grazing permit, as required by W.O. Instruction Memorandum #98-91 - “Healthy Rangeland Initiative: Implementation of Standards and Guidelines”.

d. Ongoing analyses in the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan (ICBEMP) has not indicated any new significant information that would modify the management direction in this allotment.

To summarize, the existing analysis in the LUP is still considered valid at this time, and described/analyzed livestock grazing impacts at or above the levels that are actually being realized on the allotment.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The KFRA RMP/EIS and subsequent KRFA ROD/RMP/RPS designated domestic livestock grazing as a principle or major use for this allotment under the principle of multiple use on a sustained yield basis in accordance with FLPMA. The development of the Proposed Resource Management Plan in the KFRA RMP/EIS, as adjusted or affirmed by the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS, meets NEPA standards for impact analysis. The methodology and analyses employed in the KFRA RMP/EIS are still considered valid as this planning effort is relatively recent (June 1995) and considered up to date procedurally. In addition, all the rangeland monitoring, studies, and survey methods utilized in the general area prior to and during the planning process continue to be accepted (or required) BLM methods and procedures.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action is consistent with the KFRA RMP/EIS, as affirmed or adjusted by the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS. The impacts of livestock grazing were analyzed in most of the major sections of Chapter 4 - Environmental Consequences (pages 4-1 through 4-143) in the KFRA RMP/EIS. Ample new information has come to light since completion of the plan, as noted in question 3 above, that indicates that the impacts of grazing on this allotment are probably less (i.e. more benign) than that analyzed.

The details of the proposed action were also covered in Appendix H - Grazing Management and Rangeland Program Summary (Dry Prairie Allotment - page H-56 of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS). In that section, eight different grazing allotment specific "Identified Resources Conflicts/Concerns" were listed, with corresponding "Management Objectives" to address those concerns. All of the resource related objectives are conceptually addressed by the 5 Standards for Rangeland Health and were assessed during the "Rangeland Health Standards Assessment" completed on September 8, 1999. As noted in question 3, the Standards were considered met (or have significant progress towards meeting them) and thus the objectives for Dry Prairie in Appendix H are also being met with current grazing management.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action as analyzed in the PRMP of the KFRA RMP/EIS, as affirmed or adjusted by the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS, would not change analysis of cumulative impacts. Any adverse cumulative impacts are the same as and within the parameters of those identified and accepted in that earlier planning effort for the Dry Prairie Allotment grazing use, since the proposed action was specifically analyzed in the KFRA RMP/EIS. In addition, ongoing analyses in the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan (ICBEMP) has not indicated any cumulative impacts beyond those anticipated in the earlier analyses. (In addition, the ICBEMP, due to its regional approach, does not have the specificity of the RMP.)

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The KFRA RMP/EIS and KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS were distributed to all interested publics and other government agencies for review. Since the proposed permit renewal is as listed in the LUP and that plan went through all of the appropriate and legally required public/agency review, public involvement is considered at least adequate.

All of those publics/agencies have also been kept informed of plan implementation through periodic planning update reports (i.e. May 1995, October 1997, February 1999, with another pending in early 2000). These planning updates or Annual Program Summaries, as they are now called, include information on range program and project accomplishments, updates to the RPS, monitoring reports, planned activities for the upcoming year, allotment evaluation and Standards and Guidelines assessments scheduling, and other information necessary to allow for adequate public involvement opportunities.

No specific public involvement, or "interested public" status (under the grazing regulations at 43 CFR 4100.0-5), has been requested for the Dry Prairie allotment, except from the grazing permittees who have been involved in all our processes to date.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title
------	-------

Bill Lindsey	Rangeland Management Specialist/author
(See attached NEPA cover sheet for reviewers/participants.)	

Conclusion

- ☐ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA

Note: If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.

____/s./ Teresa A. Raml_____
Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area

____3/15/00_____
Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet and Evaluating the NEPA Adequacy Criteria

These guidelines supplement the policies contained in the Instruction Memorandum entitled "Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy". During preparation of this worksheet, if you determine that one or more of the criteria are not met, you do not need to complete the Worksheet. If one or more of these criteria is not met, you may reject the proposal, or complete appropriate NEPA compliance (EA, EIS, Supplemental EIS, or CX if applicable) and plan amendments before proceeding with the proposed action. Documenting why the criterion (criteria) has (have) not been met may be beneficial in preparing new or supplemental NEPA documents, however.

Criterion 1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action at a site specifically analyzed in an existing NEPA document? In the limited situations in which an existing NEPA document(s) can properly be relied upon without supplementation, explain whether and how the existing documents analyzed the proposed action (include page numbers). If there are differences between the actions included in existing documents and the proposed action, explain why they are not considered to be substantial.

Criterion 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests and resource values? Explain whether the alternatives to the current proposed action that were analyzed in the existing NEPA documents and associated record constitute a reasonable range of alternatives with respect to the current proposed action, and if so, how. Identify how current issues and concerns were addressed within the range of alternatives in existing NEPA documents. If new alternatives are being proposed by the public to address current issues and concerns, and you conclude they do not need to be analyzed, explain why.

Criterion 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances? New information or circumstances could include the following. If any of the listed items below are applicable, you need to determine whether it (they) constitute(s) new information or circumstances.

- a. New standards or goals for managing resources. Standards and goals include, but are not limited to: BLM's land health standards and guidelines, recovery plans for listed species prepared by the Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service, requirements contained in a biological opinion or conference report related to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and the requirement to address disproportionate impacts on minority populations and low income communities (E.O. 12898).
- b. Changes in resource conditions within the affected area the existing NEPA analyses were conducted, e.g., changes in habitat condition and trend; listed, proposed, candidate, and Bureau designated sensitive species; water quality, including any identified impaired water bodies under Section 303 of the Clean Water Act; air quality; vegetation condition and trend; soil stability; visual quality; cultural resource condition; and wildlife population trend(s); etc.
- c. Changes of resource-related plans, policies, or programs of State and local governments, Indian tribes, or other federal agencies.
- d. Designations established in the affected area since the existing NEPA analysis and documentation was prepared. Designations include, but are not limited to wilderness, wilderness study areas, National Natural Landmarks, National Conservation Areas, National Monuments, National Register properties, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and Research Natural Areas.

Criterion 4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document continue to be appropriate for the proposed action? Explain how the methodologies and analytical

approach used in the existing NEPA document are current and sufficient for supporting approval of the proposed action. If valid new technologies and methodologies (e.g. air quality modeling) exist, explain why it continues to be reasonable to rely on the method previously used.

Criterion 5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Review the impact analysis in the existing NEPA document(s). Explain how the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are analyzed in the existing NEPA documents, and would, or would not, differ from those identified in the existing NEPA document. Consider the effect new information or circumstances may have on the environmental impacts predicted in the existing NEPA document.

Criterion 6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Would the current proposed action, if implemented, change the cumulative impact analysis? Consider the impacts analysis in existing NEPA documents, the effects of relevant activities that have been implemented since existing NEPA documents were completed and the effects of the current proposed action.

Criterion 7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Explain how the nature of public involvement in previous NEPA documents continues to be adequate and valid in light of current issues, concerns, views, and controversies.